

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BX

1765

.C77

1852

Harvard Divinity School



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

GIFT OF
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

5.11.

Q397

REASONS
FOR ABJURING ALLEGIANCE
TO
THE SEE OF ROME.

A Letter

TO
THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY.

BY PIERCE CONNELLY, M.A.,
FORMERLY RECTOR OF TRINITY, NATCHEZ, LATE DOMESTIC
CHAPLAIN TO THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY.

First American Edition.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY HERMAN HOOKER,
S. W. CORNER OF EIGHTH AND CHESNUT STS.
1852.

OCT 25 1971

(928)

272 y 26.0.0.

BX

1765

.C77

1852

A LETTER,

&c.

DEAR LORD SHREWSBURY,

THE friendship with which you have honoured me for more than fifteen years,—from the day when your kind courtesy first brought you to my modest apartment in “Via della Croce,” and subsequently led you to stand sponsor for me upon entering the Church of Rome,—which at last placed me in the confidential relationship of your domestic chaplain and in close intimacy,—a friendship proclaimed so honourably to me in my absence, and ever proved so affectionately at home, and which, on an occasion of great affliction, supported me by a sympathy given with manly frankness, but with all a woman’s gentleness,—such a friendship, deeply felt and dearly remembered, imposes it on me, almost as a duty, to offer you publicly, if not an apology, at least the reasons, for my renouncing, as much against my feelings as your own, not only a position of much happiness and many worldly advantages, but the religion, which at one-and-thirty years of age I had deliberately chosen, and to which you solemnly took upon you to answer for my fidelity.

You doubtless will remember my printed letter to my Bishop, when I gave up my preferment in the Protestant Church in America, long before taking any more decisive step. You will remember the principle which lay at the bottom of all my dissatisfaction with Protestantism, and what dear Bishop Otey called, my horror of the restless spirit of democracy in Church and State.

I am not yet ashamed of that principle, however I may be of the conclusions to which it led me. Nor am I ashamed of having been deluded into thinking purity and charity to be synonymous with morality in a Church which showed me such living examples as Gwendaline Talbot and Carlo Odescalchi.

Hierarchical subordination, whether in State or Church, in a kingdom or in a family, I still consider the only basis for a com-

(3)

munity to be built upon; the tranquillity of order, the only tranquillity that deserves the name. And the virtues of the angelic persons I have named, (and of others I could mention, not yet gone to their reward, seen so nearly as I saw them, were enough to establish Rome's claim to sanctity, if they had only been Rome's real coinage. But they were not. They were the pure gold that counterfeiters show you to make their base coin current.

Facts, moreover, so often a fatal source of error, from being misunderstood or imperfectly comprehended, had previously helped to lead me astray in the great matter of religion. I saw the masses of slaves around me apparently beyond the reach of the Protestant Church; while, at no great distance, on the banks of the very same river, the Roman Catholic clergy had over them absolute control, and the pious white laity of their communion thought it no shame to kneel side by side with the negroes at the foot of a common altar. I saw in the Church of Rome not only an ability to conquer, as I supposed, unto God, but an ability to control effectively and to satisfy the spirits of those it conquered. I saw a wonderful unity of dogma and, as I supposed, a logical congruity in the system built upon it.

But what I saw required a constituted "power" as well as a commission, a human Head with a divine authority; and such an authority,—an authority which could make *doubt*, anathema,—to be just or valid, must be infallible. I wanted supernatural attributes embodied visibly. I started with wholly mistaken notions of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth. I was more than half a Romanist before I ever dreamed of Rome. And when, at last, I so avowed myself to myself, it was upon no examination of such dogmas as transubstantiation, the merit of good works, or the like; it was in submission to a polity which I believed to be divinely established upon earth and to stand upon the same level as the highest dogma. I became a Roman Catholic wholly and solely on the ground of there being amongst men a living, infallible interpreter of the mind of God, with divine jurisdiction and with authority to enforce submission to it. Well do I remember the elaborate argument of one of the most distinguished—if not the most distinguished—of the canonists of Rome, which convinced me of the right and duty of papal persecution. And I defy any honest man of ordinary capacity to resist the argument, if he once acknowledge the *lowest* pretensions of the Papal Church. To burn heretics whenever practicable and expedient, (and it is now inculcated on the Roman Catholic children of England by command of Dr. Wiseman,) is as binding as abstinence upon a Friday.*

* A proposition denying the right of the Papal Church to do so, was solemnly condemned by Pius VI. "Thefts, adulteries, murders, committed by

From the moment that I accepted infallibility and a visible supreme headship over Christendom, I frankly and deliberately gave up my reason, or at least, in all matters of faith and discipline, solemnly purposed to renounce it. From that moment I never examined one single doctrine of the Church of Rome with any other view than to be able to defend it against heretics and other "infidels." And I not only gave up myself, body and spirit, but, God forgive me! I gave up all that was entrusted to me, all that was dear to me, to my new obedience. I believed myself to be the most thorough of Roman Catholics, a very fakir in my allegiance; and my ecclesiastical superiors believed me to be so too.

How often the strange *unreality* of this deep conviction must have occurred to you, dear Lord Shrewsbury, since our sad parting! Like the infallibility on which it was founded, it was a delusion. I never was wholly a subject of the mysterious Church of Rome, no more than tens of thousands of others who live and die in her.

I had put my natural affections under ban, I had renounced the senses which our Lord himself bade his Apostle, St. Thomas, appeal to finally. I had renounced much of my private reason. But I never had let go my conscience.

And so I never was—you are not, my Lord, you never can be—truly a Romanist. No man can be *truly* a Romanist who is not so *unlimitedly and without reserve*. Conscience and the creed of Pius IV. are contraries, contradictories. To make a consistent, congruous Roman Catholic, there must be unreasoning submission in morals as in faith. Bellarmine's inference from the Roman Catholic doctrine is only the inference of common sense. That doctrine practically blots God out from the moral government of all

the true believer, may be concealed, even at the expense of what we call perjury; but the crime even of secret heresy, nay, even of suspected heresy, stands in another category. Rome knows no horror like her horror of heresy. But, next to heresy, the highest of all sins in her catalogue, is THE VOLUNTARY TOLERATION OF AN HERETIC. With an heretic all bonds are *de jure* broken; and it is only by a cursed necessity that they may be submitted to *de facto*. No matter what may be the danger of the denunciation, no matter what may be the fate of the denounced, the brother is bound, as he hopes for heaven, to betray his brother, the child his own father, the wife her husband. Nor is the want of power to bring proof any excuse whatever from the obligation. And not only is this denunciation of the nearest and dearest a bounden duty, but the fierce zeal that would lead a man voluntarily to assist in torturing the doomed heretic is, to this day, solemnly set forth in the public liturgy of Rome as a blessed title to canonization: and, year after year, the people of Italy and Spain are summoned to kneel before the altar of 'St. Ferdinand of Castile,' and bless God for the model-king, who, whenever an heretic was burnt, came forward, and with his royal hands heaped fagots on the pile, which, as he believed, anticipated hell."—"CASES OF CONSCIENCE, by Pascal the Younger."—*Bosworth, Regent Street*. The Author gives the frightful but irrefragable authorities at length.

who believe it. "*The Church*," (that is, the baptized,) says Bel-larmine, "*is inviolably bound to believe that to be morally good which the Sovereign Pontiff commands, and that morally bad which he forbids.*" The conscience must be ready to be given up to another and for another, who is held to represent Omnipotence, who is held to have the right to absolve from all individual responsibility, and to whom obedience paid blindly is accounted the very highest practice of Christian virtue. "LET HIM THAT DESIRES TO GROW IN GODLINESS GIVE HIMSELF UP TO A LEARNED CONFESSOR, AND BE OBEDIENT TO HIM AS TO GOD. HE THAT THUS ACTS IS SAFE FROM HAVING ANY ACCOUNT TO RENDER OF ALL HIS ACTIONS. THE LORD WILL SEE TO IT THAT HIS CONFESSOR LEADS HIM NOT ASTRAY."*

But though my allegiance to the Church of Rome was a delusion, and a culpable delusion,—for it had its origin in carnal-mindedness and pride,—it was most sincere. The sacrifices which I made, and the ways in which I proved my devotedness, you, my dear Lord, and many other illustrious Roman Catholics, will not need to be reminded of, and will not allow to be forgotten. At the time I made those sacrifices, they were the almost involuntary expression of my passionate love to the Church of my imagination and my hope. They are even now my poor excuses to myself. Devotion to any cause, as to any person, finds its natural utterance in sacrifices. And to the last, it was not from sacrifices nor sufferings that I drew back—I drew back from nothing, even in my most secret thoughts, till I was required to be a *conscious* partaker in undoubted sin.

The great well-spring of practical iniquity in the Church of Rome, is what are called, THE COUNCILS OF PERFECTION.

These councils are *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, practised according to a vow. A vow of any of them, or of all three, may be made and *religiously* observed, either by persons living in the world of business or of fashion, or by persons living in a community separated from the world. The three vows do not, however, even in this latter case, constitute what is called a "religious" man or woman: and indeed, so far as I know, there is not a single religious woman, or legally professed nun, in any convent either in England or Scotland, though there are hundreds who believe themselves to be so, and who are not likely to be undeceived, any more than they are ever likely to learn that they have the right to demand a confessor of their own choosing.†

To constitute a religious, or one whose vows are recognised by

* "St. Philip Neri," quoted by Liguori.

† I was once admonished, in writing, by the superior of a religious congregation, how extremely dangerous it was for a nun to be made acquainted with this fact.

the Church of Rome, it is necessary that the vows should have been made in an established community which has been solemnly acknowledged and, according to set forms, proclaimed to Christendom, by the Pope, as an order of the Church of Rome. Such, for instance, is the community of the Benedictines or the Jesuits. In the case of a female, moreover, in order to constitute a religious, it is necessary that she should be *cloistered*, that is, imprisoned for life. Finally, it is necessary, for either man or woman, that the vows should be perpetual. Any other religious vows, *no matter with what solemnity of words or ceremonial they may be made, are only simple promises*, which a bishop or a priest can at any moment dispense from, at the pleasure of *either* party, the presumed consent, *or even the privacy*, of the person who has made the vows being unnecessary.*

As of course *all* vows are merely conventional in the Church of Rome,† the Pope can dispense with those of a real religious, but, inasmuch, as such vows are acknowledged to be really vows, and not only nominally so, the Pope reserves to himself the right to dispense from them.

A vow of *poverty*, in the mind of the Church of Rome, whether made in religion or out of it, does not include any idea of *want*, or suffering, or abjection. It allows the use of the *largest* amount of wealth, and when expedient, the proudest show of state, and the freest indulgence in luxury. It does not even forbid the personal possession or acquisition of property of any kind, with *dominium radicale*, provided the right of appropriating it to private purposes at private discretion be not set up nor exercised. It only forbids the possession or the use of property by the individual *independently*.

Nay, it may be well to add,—for these are truths as little known to Roman Catholics in general as to Protestants,—that the obligation of the vow of poverty, even in religion, does not require that a valid license, given to an individual to make use of wealth, should be limited to virtuous or lawful purposes. That license once given, the individual is as free from the obligation of his vow, as if it never had been made. He stands upon the footing of any un-oathed person, just (say the divines quoted by Liguori) as when the Pope by dispensation allows near relatives to marry, he not only

* *Dispensatio potest impetrari non tantum pro ignorante sed etiam invito.*
—LIGUORI.

† This is so absolutely and unlimitedly true, that though the Pope is at liberty to swear whatever he pleases, *it is impossible for him to bind himself*, —the Vice-God,—by any oath that he may make. This was logically proved and frankly maintained, without contradiction, by the General of the Jesuits in the Council of Trent. "Suppose," said Laynez, "the Pope were to engage, under a solemn oath taken by himself, not to make use of his dispensing power—the oath would cease to be obligatory the very instant that charity counselled him to break it!" PALL. CON. TRIB. xxi. 14.

authorises the marriage, but he takes away the sinfulness of incest, even if there should be no marriage.*

The vow of *chastity* is frequently confounded with the celibacy of the clergy. There is no connection whatever between the two things, beyond their unity of purpose. The only vow exacted of the Papal clergy is the pontifical, or in fact, is the vow of obedience to the Pope or his delegate-bishop. Rome has never dared to exact the vow, or even the promise of chastity from any candidate for holy orders, either before, or at, or after ordination to the priesthood.

Celibacy, in the priests of the Papal communion, is not only wholly and merely a matter of discipline, but it is only a matter of local discipline, which it has never been thought wise to make universally obligatory upon the priesthood of that communion. And this fact has for some reason or other been recently acknowledged in a letter written by Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Allen, a clergyman of the Established Church. The letter is dated Jan. 26, 1851, and without prevarication truly states, that "the" (Roman) "Catholic Church considers clerical celibacy as a matter of discipline. Hence many churches in communion with Rome have a married clergy."† And you, my Lord, may be aware that Julius III. (the Monte of the Tridentine Council) commanded Cardinal Pole to legalize the marriages of the secular Papal clergy in England, and that Pius VII., following the example of his predecessor of "blessed memory," by a bull dated August 15, 1801, did the same thing for France. These concessions, however, were not made for any moral purpose, but out of political expediency. Bellarmine frankly prefers certain incontinence in the clergy to their tolerated marriage. Nay, he goes further, and says, "for any who have made a vow of continency, it is a greater crime to marry than to give themselves up to incontinence."‡ And the comparative value which Rome sets upon the purity of those who minister at her altars, may be inferred from this, that their habitual disregard of this obligation, provided it be modest, that is, provided there be no public scandal, (and no marriage,) is not a bar to their

* *Non est censendum quod superior dans licentiam, eam limitet tantum ad usus licitos; quia ipse dando licentiam generalum, vult et potest tollere impedimentum, quod subditus habet ex licentiæ defectu ad vendendum. Pari modo ac si Pontifex dispenset cum consanguineis ad matrimonium, non solum dispensat ad actum conjugii sed tollit malitiam incestus, etiam quoad cop illic.* THEOL. MOR. v. 31, II.

† Of the authenticity of this letter the following note is sufficient evidence: "The Rev. H. Allen begs to inform the Rev. Pierce Connelly, that the correspondence between Cardinal Wiseman and himself respecting the Eastern Maronites, has been published in the Brighton Gazette of the 13th of the present month. Brighton, Feb. 26, 1851."

‡ De Monachis, lib. ii. c. 30.

lawful daily celebration of the holy Eucharist. It is not the crime, but the scandal, that is visited with ecclesiastical censures. And the crime must not only be public, but also notorious, or evident to the majority of the neighbourhood or of the convent; "*ut factum (continuum or habitual) non solum sit publicum, sed etiam notorium, seu ita evidens majori parti viciniae, seu collegii, ubi ad minus sint decem, ut nulla, possit tergiversatione celari.*"

The vow of *obedience* is, in general, the only one that is recommended to persons in married life, or to those who have not made up their minds to enter into religion.

How far the obligation of this vow reaches, internally and externally, when once made, will be best told in the words of Ignatius Loyola. "It is impossible to deny that OBEDIENCE includes not only the doing of what is commanded and the willing of what is done but the submission of the judgment also, that whatever is commanded should be thought right and true; for OBEDIENCE is a HOLOCAUST wherein the whole man, without any reserve whatever, is immolated to his Creator by the hands of his minister. The noble simplicity of blind obedience is gone, if in our secret breasts we call in question whether what is commanded be *right* or *wrong*."

Cruelty in the Papal clergy has always been proverbial; but its relentless exercise under the authority of this vow, upon hundreds of thousands,—from the troops of religious sent out to certain death on speculation, that they may be boasted of, down to its secret victims practised on in convent walls, or, more secret still, those for whom no mother-abbess nor sister-nun exists to give hope of sympathy, timid women, cut off from the world which they still live in,—can no more ever be imagined than it ever will be told. The last sort are perhaps beyond the reach of remedy; but that a Protestant nation, which paid so dearly to give freedom to the poor negro, and now by law protects the Indian widow even from herself, should tolerate convents of oathed nuns, is to me now little less amazing, than would be the selling of Government-licences to kidnap women for Australia. Such nuns, as is avowed by the Papal authorities here in England, are *de facto* prisoners for life, and will not voluntarily be allowed to be released from their secret confinement, unless they can compass a moral impossibility.*

It is true, that, though these counsels are most absurdly, and to

* "If she chooses to put on the black veil, then she will not be free in conscience to leave the convent; that is it cannot be allowed her to violate the solemn promises she will then have made to God. . . . Whoever has been subject to such compulsion, (to enter a convent,) may protest against her profession at any time within five years after it, and, if she can prove that her profession was made against her will, she will be allowed to quit the convent."—A Letter to the Editor of the "Times," signed "I. W. HENDREN, Bishop of Clifton."

any but a Roman Catholic, blasphemously held to be higher and holier than any commands of God, natural or revealed, they are still called only *counsels*. They are not pretended to be commands. But they are made, more especially the last of them, that of obedience, to be quite as operative as any divine commands. They have always been a source of fearful power to the Roman priesthood, but their lay-development in our own day has immensely multiplied that power, till it has become incalculably great, and, from its secrecy, incalculably mischievous.

By the lay-development of the religious or monastic principle, I mean the new doctrine which maintains the duty of universal obedience to a priest, and consequently the sinfulness of any man's being guided by his own conscience, or, as expressed by wretched Dr. Wiseman, "the obligation" of every baptized man "to submit himself to the direction of another in whatever concerns his own soul." Your Lordship will remember the indignation with which, the most devoted of Romanists as I believed myself, I tore the pages out of the little work which contained this last discovery in Roman morality, when it was first shown to me. Simply as a falsehood, the proposition is bad enough; but it is its uses, that best show its wickedness.

With himself for judge, my Lord, no man's crime is ever resolved upon without something of a scruple; no man's crime is in secret ever thoroughly applauded, or even quite forgiven; but, with another man to keep his conscience in the name of God! with absolution ready, or—*probability* making absolution superfluous, or—a "director's" warrant given beforehand! audacity becomes a part of faith, and remorse a criminal mistrust. A husband, a father, or a king, is struck down with as steady a hand as any sentenced felon. The eighteen Ravallacs go forth, one after another, to their task with as firm a step as any Calcraft.

The Church of Rome, as is well known, has at this late day solemnly adopted Alphonzo de Liguori as her authorized exponent of what is right and what wrong in human actions. This Liguori has insured salvation to every one who should blindly obey some one or other Papal priest. But the persuading of the superstitious and bigoted of both sexes, and a vast majority of at least female Roman Catholics, that *not* to submit thus blindly to some priest was inevitable damnation, was such a carrying out of the monastic principle as Loyola, or even Laynez, never dreamed of, and is such a multiplication of Papal police as Paul III. or the devil could hardly have hoped for three hundred years ago.

But the power given to the Papal priesthood as a polity is not the only nor the most frightful consequence of this doctrine.

What fancy-sins, so to speak, what sins upon individual account, are piled up, heap upon heap piled up, unsuspectingly, or at least

unhesitatingly and without remorse, may easily be imagined, whenever the eyes are opened to see, and the heart enlightened to understand another Papal doctrine, that of **PROBABILITY**.

It is a principle in Zoroaster's code of morals, that, in any doubt about an action, whether it be good or bad, we must abstain from doing it. The now established doctrine of Rome is just the opposite. A doubt about an action's being unlawful, at once makes it lawful. The doubt may be thrown away upon the faith of *probability*.

Nor does the doctrine of probability stop here. Rome has laid it down as a principle in her morality, that *personal conviction* of the unlawfulness or dangerousness of an action is no bar whatever to its being lawfully "directed" by a priest, or virtuously perpetrated by his penitent. The opinion of any one unrepudiated theologian makes a *probability*. And the "director" is at liberty to be silent as to what he himself in his conscience believes right, and to give advice according to what is made probable by the idiognosticism of any unheard of casuist, by the authority of some individual Sanchez or Escobar. "*Confessarius, aut alius vir doctus potest consulenti respondere secundum aliorum probabilem sententiam, si forte ei hæc sit, favorabilior, prætermisssa etiam propria probabiliore et tutiore.*" Consequently,—and the logical conclusion, so far from being kept in *petto*, is published "*urbi et orbi*;"—any Roman Catholic may without blame wander up and down the earth, from one director to another, till he find one to his mind, and thus have sacred warrant to do what in his soul he believes to be a deed of sin. "*Non sunt damnandi qui adeunt varios doctores donec unum reperiant faventum sibi.*" Nay, adds the adopted infallibility of Liguori, the search for this anticipated absolution is itself a proof of moral orthodoxy: the predetermined sinner will have *probability* before he indulges himself in crime! "*Intendit sequi opinionem!*"

Why, my dear Lord, what must men be turned into, if ever the general practice of the world could be brought down to the level of Roman Catholic principles?

All that, in unsophisticated minds, constitutes the distinction between saints and devils is at an end. A Roman Catholic living in the world may aspire to "perfection." He enters into a lay "aggregation" of some religious order, makes his vow of obedience, and may any day have the duty of shooting his Sovereign imposed on him, with the authority of fourteen at least of the most illustrious Jesuit doctors, Sa, Valentia, Delrio, Heissius, Marina, Cardinal Toledo, Suarez, Lessius, Salas, Tanner, Castro-palao, Becan, Gretzer, and Escobar. Or, he may keep a certain liberty, and, acting on Liguori's hint, choose an "agreeable" director, who

will indulge him in poisoning his own father, which, according to the Church of Rome, may occasionally be innocent and lawful.

It is not a dozen years since this new complete system of morality was solemnly adopted by the Church of Rome.* It is not, even now, known by name to one in a hundred of the educated Roman Catholic laity. Yet the wonderful organization of the Jesuits, who are the great patrons of the system, has made it almost the only one followed practically by the priests, or at least the one greatly preferred by the authorities of the Church of Rome. I was indeed, as your Lordship may perhaps remind me, allowed to renounce it for myself so lately as 1845 at Rome, at a board presided over by the Cardinal-Vicar, upon my examination for admission to the Papal priesthood; but it must be remembered that it was under high protection, that Gregory XVI., by a *proprio-motu* rescript, addressed a year before to the Cardinal-Vicar, had commanded me to be received to the priesthood without delay or interstice, and, moreover, that the only person likely to protest, the representative of the Jesuit general, was absent at the moment of the discussion, which was cut short by authority. Moreover, I did not impugn the system which I rejected for myself. No Roman Catholic would dare to do so. The Papal Church has solemnly and irrevocably made herself responsible for it. Other systems she may still tolerate, this one only she adopts and recommends, and of course forbids to be impugned. "*The works of St. Alphonso (Liguori) not only do not contain any proposition whatever which can be called schismatical or scandalous, but also none which are either pernicious, erroneous, or rash; the morals, therefore, of this saintly Bishop cannot be censured, without setting up as a censor of authority itself—without in fine, censuring the decisions of the Holy See.*"† And in Liguori's morals, perjury is made a duty obligatory upon all men. Truth is absolutely repudiated *per se* as being equally dangerous to society with falsehood; and among the practices which may be occasionally innocent, are set down, as I have just said, a wife's secret murder of her husband, a subject's murder of his sovereign, and a child's of his parent!‡ Every chain which binds men to

* When I say, new complete system, I mean of course *comparatively* new. But it has been under consideration nearly three hundred years. It has had the benefit of Pascal's immortal commentary, and was as thoroughly understood when it was adopted as it is possible any system of morals ever should be.

† "LIFE OF ST. ALPHONSO LIGUORI," edited by the "Fathers of the Oratory," "approved and recommended" by Dr. Wiseman, vol. v. 296. *Richardson and Son*, London.

‡ The following are among what the Dublin (Roman Catholic) Review very accurately terms "The decisions of the Church" of Rome:

"TO SWEAR WITH EQUIVOCATION, WHEN THERE IS A GOOD REASON, and the

each other is broken by the Papal Church. The only one she leaves unbroken is that which binds men to herself.

equivocation itself is lawful, IS NOT WRONG: for where you have a right to hide the truth, and you do it without a lie, no irreverence is done to the oath. Indeed, if it be done WITHOUT ANY GOOD REASON IT IS NOT PERJURY: for, according to one meaning of the word, or limited mental reservation, you swear the truth."

"IT IS CERTAIN, AND COMMONLY HELD BY ALL DIVINES, THAT WITH A GOOD REASON, IT IS LAWFUL TO MAKE USE OF EQUIVOCATION, AND TO CONFIRM THE EQUIVOCATION WITH AN OATH. THE REASON IS, THAT WE ARE NOT DECEIVING OUR NEIGHBOURS, BUT, FOR SOME GOOD REASON, LETTING THEM DECEIVE THEMSELVES; and on the other hand, we are not bound to speak according to the minds or meanings of other people, if there be a good reason; and any honest purpose, such as taking care of our money, or our bodily or ghostly serviceables, is a good one. There is, indeed, a question, whether it be a grave sin thus to SWEAR WITHOUT A GOOD REASON. Viva says it is: and so does Busembaum, as he asserts, with Layman, Sanchez, and others, commonly. But he is wrong in citing Sanchez, and calling his opinion common. For SANCHEZ HOLDS THE CONTRARY; and so do Cardinals Lugo and Cajetan, and the Salamanca doctors, with Soto, Valdez, &c., &c., and Busembaum himself thinks their opinion probable."

"ON THE OTHER HAND, IT IS LAWFUL TO USE RESERVATION *non-purely* MENTAL, EVEN WITH AN OATH, provided there is a possibility of detecting it by circumstances. This is the common opinion of nearly all divines. Even the over-rigid theologians deny that it is unlawful to use *non-purely* mental reservations. And the reason of it is, that if it were not lawful to use reservation *non-purely* mental, there would be no way left of concealing a secret—though you could not reveal it without loss or inconvenience,—and this would be as mischievous to human intercourse as lying. The Pontiff's (Innocent XI's) condemnation of mental reservation is rightly to be understood of reservation *purely* and *strictly* taken; and that only can be called true *mental* reservation which is made *only* in the mind, and remains so concealed, that by no means can it possibly be discovered from outward circumstances. And hence Cardenas and Felix Potesta say, that as often as any one is required to conceal another's disgrace, he may lawfully say, *I know nothing about it*; that is, *I know nothing about it proper to be told or fit to answer.*"

"If the crime charged be secret, then the witness may, *NAY HE IS BOUND*, TO SWEAR THAT THE ACCUSED IS INNOCENT."

"It is lawful to kill him by whom it certainly appears that snares are prepared to kill you; as, for example, IF A WIFE KNOWS THAT IN THE NIGHT SHE IS TO BE KILLED BY HER HUSBAND, IF SHE CANNOT ESCAPE, SHE MAY ANTICIPATE HIM."

"It is lawful to kill one who attacks your property, if it is of value, and cannot be otherwise defended or recovered again, than by the death of him who would tear it from you." (Diripientis,—the distrainer, for instance.)

"It is asked, whether it is lawful for clergymen and monks to kill an unjust attacker of their valuable goods? Lugo and others affirm this as more probable, because the right of defence is a part of natural law, and, therefore, competent to every one."

"The question is, Whether it is lawful to ANTICIPATE AN AGGRESSOR? Cardinal Lugo, Bannez, Vasquez, Molina, &c., say, that it is not necessary in order to kill an invader in your own defence, that the other should have begun to molest you; it is sufficient if he is prepared to do so."

"Although on account of any contumely, such as if a gentleman is called a liar, it is not lawful to kill another, because the affront may be and usually is, repelled otherwise, Diana, Lessius, Hurtado, and twelve others, agree

Supposed infallibility led me into the communion of exclusive Rome. And no dogma taught by her would ever have made me doubt that infallibility. It is her moral theology, her prescribed working as a practical system, that has made the falseness of her pretension to infallibility as clear to me as any one of Euclid's demonstrations.

Facts not to be misunderstood, facts authorised, avowed, defended, persevered in, facts of iniquity in isolated families and in combined kingdoms, opened my eyes to see that the spiritual despotism of the Papacy is used every where alike recklessly, to defend and establish either the right or the wrong; to propagate either the most blessed truths, or to perpetuate the grossest errors; to require of men what is beyond the reach, and contrary to the purpose of their creation, or to make crimes black as hell pass for beautiful and holy under colour of obedience; but that it is always at war with every natural, every social, every civil relation, always breeding domestic and political anarchy as cover for priestly domination to be hidden under.

There is, blessed be God, a vast amount of holiness in the Church of Rome; but it is not of her. I think it might be demonstrated that it is never sanctity that makes a "Saint" in the Church of Rome. The title, to modern canonization at least, is singularity, moral picturesqueness, no matter if beautiful or ugly, something to be run after, something to flatter pride and turn folly to account. The homely simplicity of ordinary duty is alien from Rome's ideas of merit and reward. Down to its minutest exhibitions, Papal holiness is histrionic. If a "saintly" mother writes a letter to an infant daughter, she is no longer simply and dearly her mother, but she is her mother, in some "bonds" or other, in some "wounds" or other, or in some "sacred heart." "Saintly" friends are no longer merely friends, or friends in Christ, but they are friends "in the Virgin Mary," or "in St. Philomene;" and nuns, who know no more of Latin, than a parrot of his gibes, can hardly address their brothers or sisters, or even their parents, without "Pax Christi," "Charitas," "Sanguis Domini Nostri," or some other heartless epistolary masquerading to begin with. I have been present at a pontifical high mass, solemnly, and with show of great devotion, chaunted on a stage, in sport, before cardinals and generals of orders, by noble boys under twelve years of age, in costly albe and dalmatic, chasuble and mitre, made expressly for the mimic worship. And I have cele-

THAT IT IS LAWFUL, if the aggressor should try to strike with a stick or hand, any man of rank or station, and he is not able otherwise to avert the insult."

These "decisions of the Church," are taken from "CASES OF CONSCIENCE."—*Bonworth Regent Street*. The original authorities,—every one of which I have verified,—are given by the Author.

brated a real mass, in a college chapel, where the cloth of gold, which covered reverently the tabernacle of the reserved sacrament, had only to be lifted up, to reveal filth that stank !

There is, blessed be God, still power for good in the Roman priesthood, and, in hundreds and hundreds of its members, there is a desire only for what is good. But great as may be the power of an individual priest for good, it is infinitely greater for evil. Sincere as may be an individual priest's desire for good, in the great polity of which he is an agent, often a blind agent, the good itself is always, and necessarily, a means of evil ; nay, its chief value is as a means of multiplying evil. I have had experience in the Confessional, from princes downward, and out of it, such as perhaps has fallen to the lot of no other living man, and my solemn conviction is that a celibate priesthood, organized like that of Rome, is in irreconcilable hostility with all great human interests.

Go from one corner of the globe to the remotest opposite ; take the experience of families in the highest or the very lowest rank, of the most cultivated or the most barbarous nations ;—the same strange concord of result wherever Papal influence predominates, shows a still more strange unity of purpose.

Men may be kept like domesticated animals, as in Paraguay, like savages, as in Ireland, or, as in France, they may be cockered with every comfort and every luxury of material, æsthetic civilization ; they may be democrats, as in America, or democrat-hatching absolutists any where ; but no more in the land of Galileo than in the Rocky Mountains, no more at Oxford than in Timbuctoo are they left with the intellect untethered, or the moral sense at large ; no where is individual or even universal conscience recognised as an authority ; no where is a government of laws attempted or even possible ; no where is sacredness of person any more respected than sacredness of soul. The liberty of common men—is the liberty of beasts within a park ; the liberty of kings,—a sort of game-license from the “Supreme temporal Governor of Christendom.”

Inborn reverence for man's fellow-man or self-respect is incompatible with spiritual subjugation. And, while the most unnatural incest, committed with a dispensation, ceases to be sinful, the tie that binds a woman to her husband, a son or daughter to a parent, a mother to her child, is venerated only according to an hostile priest's notions of expediency : as for loyalty to a native sovereign ! in Rome's philosophy it is a baby's fondness for a doll, something to be grown out of along with spiritual baby-hood.

All the world has seen his religion make a brave and generous boy-Emperor's sign-manual worth less than the word of honour given you by any savage Indian. All the world has seen to what

it can bring a King, whose virtue has never failed when it was tolerated by his priest. All the world has seen what was plotted in Germany, and Italy, and Spain, and France, under the secret inspiration, and now glories in the open sanction, of the Papal Church. All the world knows, what has been done by Pontifical command to check attempted civilization in Ireland, and to keep up deadly hate between the Protestant Saxon and the Papal Celt. And all the world knows the pretext for emperors, kings, and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte's helping to bring back the days of "St." Hildebrand and Paul III.

But all the world does not know that Rome loves kings, or emperors, or military adventurers just as little as she loves the rabble, and is as ready to turn her hand against them. All the world does not know how long and with what "Satanic instinct" the Papal Church has been preparing for the present development of the democratic element in Europe, nor with what consummate tact she counted on its incapacity for self-organization, and cruelly turned it to her own account. All the world does not know that La Mennais, like Ventura, was once the honoured of the Vatican, that the cry of universal suffrage was got up in France by the clergy in 1835; that already in 1837, so wise a statesman as Prince Metternich, (who at that time did me the honour to invite me to enter the Austrian diplomacy,) seemed as well persuaded as the general of the Jesuits, (who hated him cordially,) that Rome was likely, under democracy, to be as powerful as when, under despotism, Aquaviva had dictated his individual will to Europe, and taken equal vengeance on popes, kings, or communities that were refractory. All the world does not know that lay "aggregations," (which had been suppressed by command of Benedict XIV., the friend of Pombal and Ganganelli,) were restored in England in 1838. All the world does not know that the pretext of Red Republicanism in France was an after-thought of those who had long preached unceasingly, in every drawing-room in England or on the Continent, into which they were admitted, from this single text—*Almost all things are purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission*, till the Latin of their Vulgate, "*Sine effusione sanguinis, nulla remissio*," became familiar as a proverb with many at least of the Legitimist aristocracy of France. All the world does not know that Rome had never any horror, but a burning desire, for violence, no real fear whatever but of Civil independence and the freedom of the press, and that she is at this moment in alliance with Socialism in Great Britain.* All the world does not know that the Antonelli of

* I cannot resist quoting the following extract from, unhappily, one of the ablest political writers of the day. "Few even of educated Englishmen have

Ferdinand and Francis-Joseph and absolutism in 1851, is the tri-colour Antonelli of Minghetti and Galetti in 1848, the bravest reformer of the Reform ministry, as poor Minghetti himself told me, he then was.* All the world does not know that the same men who now dread nothing but the *mob*, would have raised "Te Deum," in St. Peter's, in 1848, had they seen the palaces of Doria, Borghese, and the other Roman princes sacked, and all within them pitchforked by the Contadini, (I quote the very words used to me at the time in Rome, by a chamberlain of the Papal Court,) because those princes were acquiescent in the expulsion of the Jesuits from the "Holy City." All the world does not know how so moderate a cardinal as Vanicelli groaned aloud in Rome for the blood-running gutters of Naples, and deplorably protested that three thousand bayonets would drown the bastard Papal Constitution, and float back the middle ages, at the very moment when that new-born Constitution was still, almost daily, solemnly presented to the people from the balcony of the Quirinal.—"There

any suspicion of the depth and solidity of the Catholic dogma, its wide and various adaptation to wants ineffaceable from the human heart, its wonderful fusion of the supernatural into the natural life, its vast resources for a powerful hold upon the conscience We incline to think that the Roman Catholic reaction may proceed considerably further in this country ere it receives any effectual check. The academical training and the clerical teaching of the upper classes have not qualified them to resist it. At the other end of society there are large masses who cannot be considered inaccessible to any missionary influence, affectionately and perseveringly applied. Not all men, in a crowded community, are capable of the independence, the self-subsistence, without which Protestantism sinks into personal anarchy. The class of weak dependent characters, that cannot stand alone in the struggle of life, are unprovided for in the modern system of the world. . . . The co-operative theorist appeals however, and successfully to the uneasiness felt by the feeble in the strife and pressure of the world: he fills the imagination with visions of repose and sympathy: he awakens the craving for unity and incorporation in some vast and sustaining society. And, whence is this desire, disappointed of its first promise, to obtain its satisfaction? Is it impossible that it may *accept proposals* from the most ancient, the most august, the most gigantic organization which the world has ever seen?—that it may take refuge in a body which invests indigence with sanctity,—which cares for its members one by one,—which has a real past instead of a fancied future, and warms the mind with the colouring of rich traditions,—which in providing for the poorest want of the moment enrols the disciple in a commonwealth spread throughout all ages and both worlds? *Whatever socialistic tendency may be diffused through the English mind is not unlikely, in spite of a promise diametrically opposite, to turn to the advantage of the Catholic cause.*" "BATTLE OF THE CHURCHES."—Westminster Review for Jan. 1851.

* It was *not* upon any petition of the people, or of the army, *nor* at the desire of the Ministry, but, by a *proprio-motu* command of Pius IX., when Cardinal Antonelli was residing with him in the Quirinal, as Secretary of State, that the Papal troops of the line were made to wear the tri-colour riband on their breast—in, if I am not mistaken, the month of April, 1848.

would be a little misery! but Rome would be Rome again!" All the world does not know how the Pope's chief adviser in the affairs of this United Kingdom,—to whom, in fact, the Cardinal Secretary of State referred them, when he referred them to the Propaganda,—all the world does not know how he openly anticipated, with prophetic joy, in March, 1848, what has been slowly brought about in December, 1851, nor how he blessed God fervently that there was good hope "England would now at last be *crushed*" by the union of Ireland with the unemployed standing army of France, and drew a hopeful picture of "my friend Shrewsbury, and the rest of the proud Saxon nobility, down on their knees" to Celtic priests. All the world does not know to what sort of antagonistic dignity and fearful influence, this very thorough hate of England raised that subject of Queen Victoria in her Majesty's own home dominions. All the world does not know the secret of other dignities unlawfully conferred in this Kingdom, in the name of God, simply upon a reputation of double-dealing and a supposed capacity for mischief. Nor does all the world yet know how deeply the demagogical power of the Papal priesthood is felt, nor how humbly it is acquiesced in, in high quarters in this country, nor how sadly it has lowered even ministerial loyalty. All the world does not know at what sacrifice of national reputation and of personal honour and veracity, the influence of this hostile clergy at the hustings, and its silence elsewhere, has been purchased here in England as well as in Ireland. The world does not know these things. But I know them, and I know much more.

I know this same Church of Rome, in its petty schemes of anarchy in families, more hateful and more devilish than when it deals with nations.

I have seen priests and bishops of the Church of Rome, their own convictions disregarded, and all responsibility to God and to society thrown off, in the instinct of hostility to man's natural relationships, (in spite, too, in one instance, of the private commands of the Pope himself,) I have seen them band together, for the mere sake of a legacy or a life interest, to break down laws which are looked upon, even by savages, as the most sacred of all, divine or human. I have known a husband taught and directed to deal double in the sacred matter of religion with his own high-born wife, a brother with his own high-born sisters, wives with their husbands, and daughters without number with their trusting parents. I have known, in Derbyshire, a young lady not eighteen years of age, the daughter of a widowed mother, the mother also a Roman Catholic, seduced into a convent under false pretences, kept there in spite of every effort of her family, with the approbation of the Papal authorities, and only delivered by my own public threat, as a priest, of application to the civil power and conse-

quent fear of scandal. I have seen clerical inviolability made to mean nothing less than licence and impunity. I have read to the pure and simple-minded Cardinal-Prefect of the Propaganda a narrative, written to a pious lay friend by a respected Roman priest, of such enormities of lust in his fellow-priests around him, that the reading of them took away my breath,—to be answered, “Caro mio, I know it, I know it all, and more, and worse than all; but nothing can be done.” I have known a priest (here in England) practise Liguori on his clientele simply as an amateur of wickedness, apparently without conscious malice, just as he would try poison upon dogs or cats; an Iago, without even an imaginary wrong from any body. I have known this creature get up, and very successfully, a miracle,—(I have proofs in his own handwriting,)—at the very moment when, as a brother priest satisfied me, he was experimenting in seduction. But nothing could be done! I have known a priest received and honoured at a prince-bishop’s table, when the host knew him to have just seduced a member of his own family. But nothing could be done! I have been mocked with false promises by dean and bishop in denouncing a young priest in whose bed-room,—and before there had been time for him to dress himself,—in broad day, in England, under a convent-roof, I had myself found a young nun, apparently as much at home as her confessor was himself. I have been forced to let pass, without even ecclesiastical rebuke, a priest’s attempt upon the chastity of my own wife, the mother of my children, and to find instead, only sure means taken to prevent the communication to me of any similar attempt in future.

This is a part of what has come within my own experience. But it is not yet the worst of that sad experience.

I have seen priests of mean abilities, of coarse natures, and gross breeding, practise upon pure and highly gifted women of the upper ranks, married and unmarried, the teachings of their treacherous and impure casuistry, with a success that seemed more than human. I have seen these priests impose their pretendedly divine authority, and sustain it by mock miracles, for ends that were simply devilish. I have had poured into my ears what can never be uttered, and what ought not to be believed, but was only too plainly true. And I have seen that all that is most deplorable is not an accident, but a result, and an inevitable result, and a *confessedly* inevitable result of the working of the practical system of the Church of Rome, with all its stupendous machinery of mischief.

And the system is irrevocable and irremediable.

Gregory XVI.—who had himself, as he supposed, “per instinctum Sancti Spiritus,” established it,—in the latter days of his life, (under, as is thought, the influence of clear-sighted Rossi, hated of the Jesuits more than hell,) showed symptoms of discon-

tent, and sent a deputation of cardinals to the general of the Jesuits to command moderation in its developments in France. He died. And Pius IX., on his succession, openly revolted (and this was all it was intended that he should do) against the intolerable arrogance of Jesuit rule. That amiable pontiff survived Graziosi, Ximenes, Palma,* and his first vanity. Place for repentance was found for him, and he made his peace with the great Society at Gaeta.

The brief transfer of the Papal See to that ill-omened spot will be remembered in history when the massive memorials of the Popes at Avignon are dust. There the whole fearful system of Medina, Mariana, Escobar, and Sanchez, worthy of the nether Tartarus, came practically into operation as a constituent part of European polity. Armies are henceforth to enforce on races what, until now, there had been a certain discretion allowed in practising upon families and individuals.

And the system is irrevocable and irremediable. It must be what it is, or it must cease to be.

If there is ever to be either political or social regeneration for Europe, if the Continent is ever to be any thing better than a half-way Hades, my solemn conviction is, it must be by the annihilation of the whole ecclesiastical system of the Papacy.

This is, no doubt, my dear Lord, a startling proposition. It is not likely to be accepted hastily, but I believe it will be, one day, generally, and I am persuaded, before God, that there will soon have to be considered, in this Empire and in America, the question,—not how far the toleration of Romanism is required by the principle of Religious liberty, but—how far that toleration is consistent with Natural law and Civil government.

After fifteen years of study, and travel, and sad experience, it is no longer an inquiry how to raise the negro to a level with the white man, but, how to rescue the white man from the condition of a slave. To the question, what is it makes the mightiest nation of the Continent, what makes France what she at this moment is? it seems natural to answer, what makes most individual men what they are? Certainly, nothing adventitious. Dress, Chesterfield says, will alter a man's manners, and an accident may, for a time, make almost any man discordant with himself. But, after all, circumstances leave men essentially what they find them, only more developed. It is the soul that makes the man, and its religion is a nation's soul. Cunning, mistrust, and civil impotency, treachery,

* Graziosi, the Pope's anti-Jesuit Confessor, is said to have opportunely died a natural death. Ximenes, the chief editor of the "*Labaro*," the organ of the Gioberti party, (anti-Mazzini,) Rossi, Prime Minister, and Palma, Latin Secretary, were all openly murdered in Rome, and their assassins have not been, and never will be, brought to justice.

cruelty, and sensuality, follow the Roman superstition, when established, just as they follow hereditary corporal slavery.

Europe of the middle ages, was perhaps a degeneracy from the world that Domitian reigned over. Popular delusion, the secret of despotism, "*totum consilium sapientum*" as St. Augustin calls it, was still the basis of all government; and Papal Rome, equally intolerant of truth, and equally impatient of virtue, was far more deeply learned, than her Pagan progenitor, in the science of corruption. It is hardly possible to make up the sum of gratitude that is due to those, who, under God, set England free. Whatever may be said of unwise, cruel, wicked measures, the policy of the English Reformation was not cruel, nor wicked, nor unwise. It was simply honest. It was made in earnest, and saved the Anglo-Saxon race, and put the only effectual drag on tyranny. Were it not for the Protestant monarchy of England, Christendom of today, would be the Christendom of the middle ages; burning heretics would be a holy-day amusement for every city-populace, and ostentatious concubinage would be, in Europe, as it is in Mexico, and parts of South America, a grateful and respected promise of moderation in the clergy.

No! it is not civil liberty that is the first want of the Continent of Europe, or of the Spanish Republics of America. The want is—the education necessary for men to be free; the perception of what is liberty; the want is—EMANCIPATION FROM A PSEUDO-DIVINE JURISDICTION UPON EARTH. This is the want that makes the darkness of their future, as of their present and their past. Rome weighs upon her victims like an eternal nightmare. Who was more impatient of the oppression than Venice? But was her proudest patrician ever free? Nay, is Prussia, reduced to a semi-papal province by *concordat*—is Prussia, or any great kingdom of the Continent, free? Even England, blessed England, after three centuries of too patient struggle, has not yet delivered her laity, her widows and her orphans, her poor and the stranger within her gates, from the barbarism and chicane, the plunder and the mockery of bequeathed Papal judicature and Papal placits, still called "law!"

I can understand, easily enough, the indignation expressed so generally at the Papal Aggression here in England, and at the Presidential *coups d'état* in Rome and France, but I do not see how that indignation can be explained on the principles that would protect the Papal system. It is no more the nephew of the Emperor, than the Emperor's ghost, that has made France what she is, or made her require and welcome what she does. In accepting so unanimously and so unreservedly the Prince President for her master, France is only the France of the Crusades; and since the days of the Crusades France has had no Sovereign, more blessed

and honoured of the Church of Rome or that has hitherto been more faithful to that Church than Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. As for free institutions! I do not believe that he or any man could have governed France with them. No Nerva Cæsar, nor Nerva Luther could of a sudden combine liberty with sovereignty, among men long degraded, not into the slavery of silence merely:—"quid ultimum in servitute," as Pagan Rome imaginéd,—but into forgetfulness of what is liberty, of what it is that makes a man a man.

And this is what Papal Rome has, upon principle, brought France to, what she has brought her world, her "orbis terrarum" to. This is what, upon principle, it is her duty to labour to bring the "partes infidelium" to. And wherever the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope is nationally recognised, wherever the sovereignty of the Civil State is divided with a Foreign Ecclesiastic, the first step and the most important step has been already taken in debasement and apostasy. Religion is ever a sacred and a mysterious thing, and, whether in a great people or a little child, cannot be safely tampered with. A supernatural Power established visibly on earth, cannot be half-acknowledged. And a supernatural Power, acknowledged, with natural rights respected,—a Pontifical, *jure divino*, jurisdiction, with Civil liberty, is a more monstrous imagination than the centaur or the spinx. It is a bicipital absurdity; and, as such, has ever been most contemptuously repudiated by the "Holy See." Nothing is so deeply or so proudly felt at Rome, as the triumph of bringing a Protestant kingdom down to a *concordat*. No claims, which the Papal Church herself can make, to be a Power vested with right divine to meddle every where, are half so equivocal as acknowledgments, as cries for help or mercy, from enemies, whose hostility to her is their distinction, is what gives them their very name of PROTESTANTS. A *concordat* even of preliminaries, is, to the haughty mind and heart of Rome, the triumph of all triumphs, though she seem to have yielded every thing. It is, as she knows well, not the white cap and cassock, not the triple crown nor mystic keys, not cardinals in conclave nor priests afild, that make the Pope Vice-God,—but greedy necessity, knee-crooking fear.

Qui finxit sacros auro vel marmore vultus,
Non facit ille deos! QUI ROGAT,—ille facit.

Papal Rome at least is not ignorant that there is but one ground for her to stand upon: and she has never pretended that she will be, or that she can be, contented with toleration, or independence, or equality. Domination is the condition of her existence.*

* And the Liberal Pius IX., in 1851, lays down, as will be seen, among

Terms often act, and of course are often used, like spells. As it were conventionally, they suspend the exercise of reason. They convey no well-defined idea, they only exercise an influence sensitively. "Religious liberty," or "Liberty of conscience," is one of these terms. Yet, according to both Locke and Montesquieu, religious liberty may require intolerance of an intolerant religion: the very spirit of peace and gentleness may require war to be waged by the State against an aggressive religion. The religion of the Egyptians, (with which, unhappily, that of Christians was confounded,) was not tolerated by the old Romans, and the reason was, says Montesquieu, "Qu'elle etait intolérante, qu'elle voulait dominer seule, et s'établir sur les débris des autres; de manière que l'esprit de douceur et de paix qui régnait chez les Romains fut la véritable cause de la guerre qu'ils lui firent sans relâche." I cannot bring myself to acquiesce in this principle. I object as strongly as any man to interfering with the human spirit in its sacred relations with God. I am quite ready to acknowledge that believing in transubstantiation is no more an affair for preventive legislation than dreaming. But I cannot think that the toleration by law of the ecclesiastical system of the Church of Rome is a mere question of religious liberty. Human actions cannot be put in the same category with human thought, the deeds of the body with the working of the spirit. And the question is what power, a National or a Foreign, a Civil or a Pontifical one, shall control actions.

Religious liberty, it is quite clear, ought not to imply any exemption from moral duties or from political obligations.

But Rome claims the right to dispense, and she does dispense from both.

Religious toleration, it is quite clear, ought not to imply permission publicly to organize insubordination in the State, or to propagate "a systematized philosophy" of perjury, cruelty, and violence.

But Rome claims the right to do both, and she does both.

Is it quite fair to hunt down the poor Irish Romanist for perjury or murder, while the one is a duty and the other a right, according to his tolerated religion? If to teach the obligation of perjury and the lawfulness of assassination* be a part of religious

her Religious *Rights*, even in foreign countries, *Exclusive Domination*; and not merely *exclusive Domination*, but the *suppression* of every form of religion except her own.

* Gregory XIV. was a man of extreme opinions and violent passions. (He died of rage.) He had a prejudice against the right of private murder, and fulminated a bull against what he was pleased to call, assassination. It was soon seen that such an invasion of established prerogative was untenable; and accordingly, by a "decision of the Church" of Rome, merely to way-lay and murder in the dark, is not assassination. To constitute assassination, it

liberty and protected by the law, surely to practise perjury and assassination ought to be considered a part of religious liberty also !

And why may not the Mormon chief-priest of the "holy city" of Nauvoo, upon his plea of *jure divino* jurisdiction, enjoin three wives upon his British deacons, as well as a Papal delegate forbid or annul a lawful English marriage ? Why may not a Shaker-rabbi mutilate children as well as a Papal official forcibly confine women for life, with torture, under the name of *penance*, inflicted at discretion ?

But I am far from conceding that, abstractedly speaking, independently of an immoral code, foreign *jurisdiction* is ever wisely tolerated in a Protestant country under a pretence that it is a part of rightful religious liberty. By *religious* liberty, I understand liberty for men to hold and teach what they believe to be dogmas of faith, and to practise, innocuously to the public, their peculiar form of worship. I understand by *jurisdiction*, legal authority to enforce obedience in any way, through the conscience or by the sword.

The confusion of ideas between spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, and the general misapprehension of what is the jurisdiction that Rome claims as a right, must be my excuse for making a large extract from a pamphlet lately published in answer to the Dublin Review's defence against "Cases of conscience."

"II. Our Papal GOVERNOR is representative and delegate of St. Peter and the Pope in his SUPREME TEMPORAL JURISDICTION OVER CHRISTENDOM, 'Summa potestas temporalis,' BELLARM. de Rom. Pon. lib. v. 5. See also COUNCIL OF TRENT, §§ xv. xxii. xxiv. xxv. *et passim*, and also, *passim* the CONTINENT OF EUROPE.

"And, in order more clearly to understand the Papal pretensions on this head, it must be remembered that pontifical jurisdiction, according to the church of Rome, is threefold. First, of order, 'potestas ordinis,' for ordaining, &c. ; second, of internal jurisdiction, 'altera jurisdictionis interioris, ad populum Christianum regendum in foro conscientiae,' for the government of the Christian world in the court of conscience ; third, of temporal jurisdiction, for GOVERNING the Christian world outwardly, 'tertia ad eundem populum REGENDUM in foro exteriori.'

"Bellarmine says that about the first of these rights, or powers of jurisdiction, there is no dispute whatever ; that about the second, that is, the right of erecting the 'tribunals' of confession, of binding and absolving, there are two opinions ; but that *both opinions agree in this*, that the exercise of it, the right to use it

is necessary that the deed should be done, as it were professionally, by a hireling employed under contract for the express purpose.

"*Non censeri assassinos, nisi qui homicidium patrant cum pacto, ut manans aliquod temporale eis persolvant.*"—LIGUORI, iv. 364.

(jurisdiction *in foro interiori*) depends upon the right of temporal jurisdiction, 'Ambo tamen (sententiæ) convenient quod usus hujus potestatis pendeat a jurisdictione exteriori.' (Ib. iv. 24.) That is to say, that no priest, nor bishop, nor the Pope himself, has the right to set up a visible confessional, or to pretend to govern men in the court of conscience, unless he can derive it from an acknowledged right of external or temporal jurisdiction.

"What, then, is this right or power of external jurisdiction,—(the Sacrosanct Council of Trent has taken the wise precaution in proclaiming it, to command its exercise, in general, only when expedient)—what then is this jurisdiction, by virtue of which priests hear confessions, and a legate GOVERNS in this 'remote region' of Christendom ?

"It is THE TEMPORAL SUPREMACY OF CHRISTENDOM, 'Summa potestas temporalis' (ib. v. 5.) The power of GOVERNING the Christian world with external jurisdiction, 'potestas quæ refertur ad REGENDUM populum Christianum in foro exteriori' (ib. iv. 22).

"In whom is this supremacy vested ?

"It is vested wholly and solely in the Pope, and derived from him to other bishops ; otherwise, as Bellarmine observes, the Pope could neither take it away from a bishop nor modify the use of it (ib. c. 24), which, yet it is solemnly decreed by the Council of Trent and universally conceded, that he has the right to do.

"What is the origin of the Papal temporal supremacy ?

"It is *jure divino*, not indeed directly and immediately for its own sake, but for the sake of the Pope's spiritual power, *ratione spiritualis habet saltem indirecte potestatem quamdam, eamque SUMMAM in temporalibus*' (ib. v. 7), '*in ordine ad bonum spiritualem*' (ib. v. 6), as a means and necessary for the spiritual good of Christendom.

"How far does this supremacy extend *de jure divino* ?

"It extends to THE DISPOSING OF ALL THE TEMPORAL POSSESSIONS OF ALL CHRISTIANS, of the crown and sceptre of the sovereign, and the last penny of the beggar,—to the disposing of their lives in this world and of their sorrows in the dim, countless, but still temporal, ages of purgatory. 'Asserimus,' says Bellarmine, and he might well be bold when he was merely asserting what the Sacrosanct Council of Trent had taken for established, 'asserimus Pontificem ut Pontificem habere SUMMAM potestatem disponendi de temporalibus rebus omnium Christianorum.' (Ib. v. 7.)

"But from rights, as the Sacrosanct Council and Bellarmine knew well, there result duties. And it is from this supremacy in temporals that there devolves upon the Pope and his plenipoten-

tiary delegates THE DUTY, whenever it is possible or expedient, of COMPELLING all Christians, kings as well as their subjects, 'to do what he commands and not to do what he forbids,'—'DEBET pontifex omnibus Christianis, ergo ac regibus, ea jubere atque ad ea *cogere* ad quæ quilibet eorum secundum statum suum debent, etiam per excommunicationem ALIASQUE COMMODAS RATIONES.' (Ib. v. 7.) And, exclaims triumphantly the 'Venerable,' (for Rome has decreed to Bellarmine the first order of sainthood,) Witness the example of Gregory VII., who deposed the Emperor Henry IV. and commanded another to be chosen in his stead; of Innocent III., who in like manner deposed Otho IV.; of Innocent IV., who deposed Frederic II. and gave the Lusitanian king a coadjutor to administer his realm; of Clement VI., who deposed Lewis IV., and of eight other pontiffs, whom he names, with the instances of their dutifully sending poor kings adrift. (Ib. v. 8.) And he indignantly repugns the over-heavy, 'nimis gravis,' accusation, that Rome has ever, except from necessity, tolerated, or now tolerates, an heretic upon any throne in Christendom. Her weakness, not her will, consented to the reigning of Nero, Julian, Valens, or the like: physical force was wanting, 'id fuit quia deerant vires temporales.' And now, as then, the duty and the will are both the same, 'novi principes et reges constitui propter eandem causam;' and a new sovereign would replace VICTORIA if Rome had but the power, 'si vires adfuissent.' (Ib. v. 7.)

"And to come down to later authorities than those of Bellarmine and Clement VI., I shall conclude with one from a living Legate and one from a living Pope.

"Our venerated hierarchy and clergy, in the fulfilment of their duties, will inculcate the strict and religious duty of selecting as representatives of the people those men who are best fitted to support in the Imperial Parliament OUR RELIGIOUS RIGHTS.—'Address to the Catholics of the United Kingdom, signed, PAUL, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH, PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND.'

"What is understood by 'our RIGHTS'?

"Let Pius IX. explain. In his dealings with a neighbouring kingdom that pontiff declares, in an allocution to the cardinals of the Church of Rome, delivered in the same month and the same year (September, 1851) as the address quoted above, that 'HE HATH TAKEN THIS PRINCIPLE FOR BASIS, THAT THE CATHOLIC RELIGION WITH ALL ITS RIGHTS OUGHT TO BE EXCLUSIVELY DOMINANT IN SUCH SORT THAT EVERY OTHER WORSHIP SHALL BE BANISHED AND INTERDICTED.'

"In the same allocution the Pope explains, also, that by ecclesiastical LIBERTY is meant 'THE FREE EXERCISE OF THEIR PROPER EPISCOPAL JURISDICTION BY THE BISHOPS.' Now, the Sacrosanct Council of Trent has decreed, 'inviolably,' that this

JURISDICTION reaches to civil officers, 'even though created by imperial or royal authority;' that it may be exercised over 'cleric or layman, by whatever dignity pre-eminent, be he EMPEROR or KING;' that it includes 'the RIGHT, if it be judged expedient, to proceed against all persons whatsoever, by means of pecuniary fines, by distress upon the goods or arrest of the person, and, if there be contumacy, by smiting with the sword of ANATHEMA.' (§ xxii. cc. x. xi.; § xxv. c. iii.)*

I will add what has not been told by Pascal the Younger, that Bellarmine cannot be called an ultra-Romanist; on the contrary, his work was no sooner published at Rome than it was immediately condemned and prohibited by the Pope, on the ground that it "*derogated from the plenitude of the Pontiff's rights*," though it has since been taken out of the "Index" as a matter of expediency.

Now, therefore, Romanism is not merely a religion, a system of relations with the invisible world, a rule of faith and form of worship; it is an organized, terrestrial polity, with its own visible Head, its own laws, its own penalties, and its own instruments, (often secret ones,) for the enforced regulation of men's actions in every relation and in every imaginable contingency of sublunary life.

The moral code of Rome, personal, social, and political, is essentially a legislation, and it is practically carried into effect. This code is completely antagonistic to that of England, and I am persuaded to that of nature. Perjury, by the law of England and by the law of nature, is a crime. Perjury in a Court of Justice is doubly a crime. But Rome rules, that a witness, juridically interrogated upon oath, by a Court which she does not consider legitimately constituted, as the Arches' or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, is not bound to speak the truth. "*Notandum est CERTUM esse, quod judici non legitime interroganti testis non tenetur fateri veritatem; tunc enim poterit licite respondere, ETIAM CUM JURAMENTO, crimen nescire, ita ut teneatur illud ei manifestare.*" Nay, be the Court ever so legitimately constituted, even according to the mind of Rome, Rome rules that a witness is BOUND to swear that he knows nothing of a murder which he has seen deliberately committed, provided the secret of the guilty man is otherwise secure. "*Etiam legitime et juridice interrogatur non teneris testari sequentibus casibus. I. Si scias rem ex confessione. II. Si accepisti sub secreto naturali. III. Si ex testimonio, tibi vel tuis imminet notabile damnum,*" &c. &c. "*Si crimen fuerit omnino occultum; tunc enim potest, imo TENETUR*

* "Wiseman versus Pascal the Younger, with a Reply."—*Bosworth, Regent Street.*

testis, dicere (cum juramento) reum non commisisse." Assassination, by the law of England and by the law of nature, is always a crime. But Rome rules that to thus make away with a king, a father, or a husband, may occasionally be an undoubted right of any one, "*ad defensionem vitæ et integritatis membrorum licet etiam filio, religiosi, et subditis se tueri, si opus sit, cum occisione, contra ipsum parentem, abbatem, principem.*" "*Si uxor sciat noctu occidendum a marito, si non possit effugere, licet eum prævenire.*"* And this right moreover, this private "right of killing," this "*jus occidendi*," may be exercised by deputy,—provided it be done out of charity! "*Quandocumque quis juxta supradicta, habet jus occidendi*, (an husband or a father, an abbot or a king) *id potest etiam alius pro eo piæstare cum id suadeat charitas.*" And these "decisions of the Church" of Rome, are not only a law to every true Roman Catholic, but if enjoined by a confessor, (and in a convent they may be enforced by torture,) they are often ten times more a law than any act of Parliament.

There are, then, two hostile polities face to face, one calling itself the State of England, the other, the Church of Rome; each claiming the right of legislation and supremacy of temporal jurisdiction. The one, a local, national, Civil Government,—the other, a Foreign Sovereignty, claiming freedom for its full antagonistic development, under pretext of the religious element mixed up with it.

The legitimate deduction—that the toleration by law of an ecclesiastical system (not merely of religious opinions, be it remembered) implies the toleration, not only of itself and its constituent parts, but of all its reasonable and fair consequences,—is made by Roman Catholics, and, I am told, is sustained by high judicial authority in this kingdom.

The toleration, therefore, of such a system as that of Rome, is not only incompatible with civil supremacy, and national self-government, but with the well-being of society or the safety of the State. It is the toleration of the most perdurable and powerfully organized, implacable antagonism which the world has ever seen, and, at the same time, of such a "systematized philosophy" of false, foul, and cruel immorality, as is scarcely to be conceived. It is the toleration of a master, who acknowledges no fellow-master upon earth, and of a wicked, an unnatural, and an heartless master.

The principle of political disqualification for religious opinions is a part, and wisely a part, of the Constitution of Protestant England. Roman Catholic opinions are, therefore, so far acknowledged adverse to civil order and tending to the dissolution of the State.

* See note B. at end.

But toleration of the ecclesiastical system of Rome is, in fact, a civil disqualification of Protestants, on account of their religious opinions.

If religious toleration means the right, guaranteed by law, to every man to *act*, in every relation of life, upon what he chooses to call his religious opinions, or upon what are the fair and reasonable developments of an ecclesiastical system such as that of Rome, there is no longer such a thing as civil equality between Protestants and Romanists.

Roman Catholics are first of all subjects of an Italian Prince,* to whom they owe allegiance as the Vicar of God, as a priest appointed of God to be Head over Christendom, all whose laws claim a Divine sanction. Roman Catholics are subjects of the Civil State, therefore, and are bound by the laws of the Civil State, only so far as the Italian prince allows them to be. To think, then, that Protestant subjects of the State, and spiritual subjects of the Pope, in the same State, are civilly on the same footing, is absurd.

The oath of civil allegiance which binds one, Rome solemnly declares, carries with it no obligation, if taken in mockery by the other. "*Qui exterius tantum juravit, sine animo jurandi, non obligatur, nisi, forte, RATIONE SCANDALI, cum non juraverit, sed lus-erit.*" The last testament of a deceased relative, which binds the conscience of the Protestant heir, is solemnly declared to be valid, only according to expediency for the Church of Rome.† The life of the most determined enemy is beyond the reach of a religious Protestant in thought even, while a wrong, or even an insult, places a man at the mercy or the discretion of any priest in the kingdom. The bargain between a Protestant bailiff and his Protestant master binds both, with a Roman Catholic servant it binds only his master.‡ These are all "decisions of the Church" of Rome, to censure which, according to Dr. Wiseman, is "to censure the decision of the Holy See," is "to set up as a censor of authority itself." Such toleration of Romanism must be a pretty extensive civil disqualification for Protestants any where, with Irish Protestants it is a disqualification for living a day longer than may be expedient to a priest, and is as near domination as well can be imagined.

Indeed, it seems to me not only that no Roman jurisdiction can

* See Note C. at end.

† "In alterations of last wills—which alterations ought not to be made except for a just and necessary cause—the bishops, as DELEGATES TO THE APOSTOLIC SEE, shall, before the alterations aforesaid are carried into execution, ascertain, &c., &c."—*Council of Trent*, sess. xxiii. *de Refor.* cap. vi. *Waterworth's Translation*. Dolman, 1848.

‡ For the atrocious "decisions" on the right of theft, "secret self-compensation" by servants, even for "*acts of courtesy*" rendered spontaneously, see the Pamphlet quoted above. "Wiseman versus Pascal the Younger, with a Reply."—*Dosworth, Regent Street*.

ever consistently be recognised by Protestants, but that Roman Orders can no more consistently be recognised by England, than the Stuart title to the throne can be recognised by the house of Brunswick. Of course I do not mean to say that a Roman priest is to be reordained on his conversion, but only that a Protestant State can know nothing of his orders until the Established Episcopate has given them currency. Until that is done, it appears to me the Roman priest is simply a Dissenting minister, and I cannot comprehend his right to a standing better than that of any other Dissenting minister, on the sole ground of his being under foreign allegiance, and claiming to exercise foreign jurisdiction.

In England and Ireland, as in France, and far more so, men are not only still human and religious, but the established religion is, in common, episcopal.

To recognise then, in these countries, any man as a "bishop," is to recognise a claim to exercise jurisdiction; but to recognise any man as a Papal bishop, is, as has been shown, to recognise a claim to supremacy of jurisdiction, is to recognise the claim of a *jus divinum* to exercise dominion, within territorial limits, over the person and possessions, over the body here, and the body and soul hereafter, of every baptized human being. True, the Council of Trent, has directed the exercise of this temporal dominion to be regulated by "expediency," and consequently, in England, it is, in general, (though by no means always,) secret. But that Papal ecclesiastics or foreign officials do enforce the claim when they think it "expedient," any one, who is in earnest, may have proved to him as easily as that they set it up.

Nor, alas! is this all that must be remembered. The Papal ecclesiastics who thus "govern" in England, are not *merely* foreigners in allegiance and affection. They are, even in the midst of Roman Catholics, a caste apart. Nay, it is not even merely as a caste, and an alien, and an hostile caste, that they are separated from the rest of the community; that were, indeed, a fearful enough evil to be delivered from, for, as has been wisely said by one of the most thoughtful of modern statesmen, "Caste has been the instrument of establishing among men, instead of a law of love, almost a law of mutual aversion and contempt." But *Caste* still leaves men with brothers and sisters, and fellow-men and women, whom they may love and be united to; it still leaves men innocently human; it still leaves sacred and dear the ties of wife and daughter, son and brother, father and sovereign; its teachings are not necessarily "doctrines of DEVILS;"—while, with truly Satanical malignity, the *Religious Celibacy* of Papal Rome, makes disruption from all human ties obligatory, makes ἀσπργή,* the want of natural affection, a virtue, even in a mother for her infant child.

* Rom. i. 31.

When I compare the Church of Rome, as I now see it, with what I painted her to myself, with the imaginary realization of our blessed Saviour's scheme for fallen man's sanctification, no words can convey my horror at the contrast. I should often doubt the conclusions of my reason, mistrust my moral sense, and reject my certain knowledge as a dream, if God's written word and man's universal conscience, if the experience of both hemispheres and of ten centuries did not confirm me.

And though I acknowledge, dear Lord Shrewsbury, that you are the man of all others in the world, to whom I am most bounden by duty, as well as in affection, to defend my renunciation of communion with Rome, I should not have had the heart to do so, if I doubted for a moment that the character of the system which I have revealed, was as abhorrent to you as to myself. Nay, more, I should belie my conscience, if I professed to think that the mass of Englishmen who think themselves Roman Catholics, really are so. I profoundly doubt, if,—out of the ranks of the recent converts to Romanism,—there can be found a dozen Englishmen of thirty years of age, who are *really* Roman Catholics, who are ready to act upon their principles, when they maintain the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and his infallibility, as Mouthpiece of the Almighty, in faith and morals.

The ties which bind an individual to his hereditary religion partake of the mysterious character of religion itself. God forbid I should ever treat them with irreverence. But religion has claims as a national, as well as an individual affair. And the religion of the Bible, protesting against that of Rome, is emphatically the national religion of Great Britain and America. And in my soul, I am persuaded it is their religion, that has made these countries, and that keeps them what they are, just as I am persuaded it is its religion that has made France what it is just now. Those who think any religion contemptible because it mixes error with truth, or because they see its ecclesiastics individually contemptible, are hopeless. They are almost fit to be considered, what Rome has always considered, *mere* men and women, as creatures half-way between priests and monkeys, not to be reasoned with, but ruled absolutely.

In the first interview I ever had the honour to have with Prince Metternich, the subject of his most minute inquiries was the religious development of America, politically considered, the relative numbers of the different sects and their distinctive doctrines and discipline. Upon my remarking one day in his private cabinet the admirable "American Almanac" for the current year, he playfully boasted that I would find few in Europe better acquainted with my native country than himself: but it was ever, even in that new empire, its religion that was his chief interest, that which he considered the preponderant interest of the State. The experience

of Europe during the last four years, it would seem, should be enough to make all men think it so in every commonwealth.

What thinking man, (thinking of other things than himself I mean,) what thinking man, that saw into whose hands France placed anew the rudder of the State in 1848, but knew where those hands would guide it? whether Cavaignac or Bourbon, Louis Bonaparte or Orleans, held the baubles of authority.

When Machiavelli, whose infidelity was learnt from Popes, but whose depth of wisdom was all his own, when Machiavelli points to profligate and dismembered Italy, "This," he exclaims, "is what we owe the Church of Rome." What kingdom on the Continent, but may now echo Machiavelli's gratitude for Italy!

In bringing this painful Letter to a conclusion, perhaps it only remains for me to add, that, though I have not entered into the religious part, properly so-called, of the Papal System, it is not because I still cling to any single one of the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome; but I have not forgotten the awful regard with which I ever approached them, during my great delusion. Their mysterious fascination of soul and sense, must have been felt to be imagined. God only knows, how my whole being was bowed down before, what I believed, His real presence in the mass, how I almost seemed to myself sensible of angels kneeling round me, when I lifted up the host to be adored. And I cannot but respect the deep sincerity of such faith in others, however, I can no longer hold it, when all the visionary basis it was built upon is gone for ever.

No one knows better than your Lordship what a wretch it was that broke me from the Church of Rome. But painful as it was, I should be the most ungrateful of men, if I did not ever bless God, publicly as well as in private, for the grace that delivered me, and if in doing so, I did not also give my humble thanks to Him through Jesus Christ our Lord, that the grounds on which I renounced the communion of that Church, left my faith unshaken; that, of His great mercy, I was saved from the infidelity which is a too intelligible reaction with those who, because the faith which grasped at "the secret things of the Lord our God" has proved a great delusion, reject also "those revealed things which belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of the law."

Believe me ever,

Dear Lord Shrewsbury,

With the sincerest affection and regard,

Your faithful servant,

PIERCE CONNELLY.

*Albury Heath, Guildford,
Dec. 27, 1851.*

NOTES.

NOTE page 14, line 15, "colour of obedience."

PAPAL morality is just as multiform as the aberrations it is designed to trade in; rigid for the rigid, lax for the licentious, daring and desperate for the blindly obedient. The Jesuit Diocastillo makes it the glory of a theologian that he should be contradictory, even with himself, in the matter of morality, that he should reprobate in one page, what he is going to counsel in another. "True," says he, "Diana contradicts himself, not once only, but repeatedly; and, so far from blaming him for it, we consider it matter of thanksgiving. Suiting his vast and copious learning to the wants, *or even the desires*, of whoever it may be that seeks counsel at his lips, when authority is found for contradictory opinions, he gives one to one penitent and the opposite to another: and he does so safely. What, I beg to ask, can practically be more to a director's purpose?" "Ecce hic auctor sibi contrarius est, id tamen, quod illi non semel contigit, non reprehensione sed gratiarum actione dignum est. Nempe vir, pro communi bono laborans, et communi utilitati serviens, plurima lectione dives et copiosus, pro occurrenti consultationum et querentium necessitate, *aut etiam desiderio*, jam huic, jam illi parti adhæret, quando pars utraque probabili ratione et doctorum virorum auctoritate nititur et in praxi utriusvis operari tutum est; voluit autem nobis in medium proferre ad hunc ipsum finem, quid in una, quid in alia occasione responderit querentibus. Quid quæso utilius pro praxi?"—DE SAC. EV., iv. 10. What, indeed! "And," adds Diocastillo, with all the indignation that became so liberal a spiritual politician, "with this passing remark, let me teach modesty to the envious and obscure cavillers who have irreverently raised objections to Diana's contradictions." I will give an historical illustration of the "practical utility" of CONTRADICTIONS in political morality. The truly orthodox Romanism of the Spanish people enabled Aquaviva, (the Jesuit General, or Black Pope of the day,) to govern Philip II. by a wholesome fear of what we call assassination. But Romanism having been checked in its development in England, it was out of the question to influence James II. in that way, even if it had not been notorious that he was English, at least in animal bravery. So then a CONTRADICTION was resorted to; and I will place it in parallel lines with the true doctrine of the Church, as expressed by the most eloquent of its innumerable defenders, and one, moreover, who was tutor to Philip's II.'s son.

"Any private man, whoever he may be, has a right, equal to the best, to kill the king declared a public enemy; let him only have the will to fling away hopes of impunity, despise the risk, and dare attempt to serve his country. I never will believe that he who makes essay to slay him, has

"It is not in the power of the people to call God's immediate minister to an account: It is *per me*," (that is God, or *His Vicar*,) "*Reges regnant, not, per me Senatus Populus que*, the senate and the people reign in an imperial state. There is no room for intruders betwixt the King of Kings and

done any thing whatever which he has not a right to do. . . . It is, indeed, more virtuous and more magnanimous openly to satisfy the grudge, and fall upon the country's enemy before the eyes of all the world. But there is more prudence in trying to catch him, as in a trap, by artifice. For then the happy issue comes without tumult, and with the certainty of less danger, public as well as private. . . . Whether open force is resorted to and he is struck down in the midst of insurrection, and arms publicly taken up . . . or, with greater caution, he dies by stratagem and device, a single man devoting himself, or a few sworn together secretly against his life, and struggling, each at his own peril, to redeem his country safe! Suppose that they escape! Like great demi-deities, they are revered their whole life long. And if they fall! they fall a sacrifice, grateful to the gods and grateful unto men, in a noble undertaking, and are illustrious to all posterity."—*Mariana De Rege et Regis Institutione*.

His vice-gerents. . . . Is a prince religious, just, gracious, merciful? Is he resolute in war and temperate in peace? Is he firm to his honour, to his word, to his conscience? Is he tender of his people and his friends, and placable to his enemies? Is he all this and as much more as might be added to make up the consummated character of a governor after God's own heart? *Per me REGES regnant*. On the contrary, is his government heavy by oppression, by injustice, by all sorts of vexations? *Per me REGES regnant* still. The good and the bad princes are creatures both of the same power, stamped with the same impress, and as inviolably sacred, the one as the other. . . . *Per me REGES regnant*. These few words preach this doctrine to all kings and governors.—By *me* it is, you monarchs of the earth, saith the Almighty, that you reign. There is no power that hath any thing to do with you, I have placed you on the throne of my greatness, and invested you with the robes of my dignity: who shall dare to oppose you? You reign by my orders; who shall presume to dispute your authority? You reign in my name; and who shall question your deputation? Stick to the order I have given you, and execute it. I will have no shares in royalty. I will suffer no popular competitions, whether the prince or the subject be uppermost, or which is the same thing, whether God or man shall be master. Do you maintain the dignity and prerogative of your commission, and I will maintain the sacredness of your person. . . . Do kings govern well?—thank God, and bless Heaven for it. Do they misgovern?—there is no affronting the minister, upon any account whatsoever, without falling foul upon the ordinance, and consequently on the divine authority itself."—*Sermon preached before JAMES II., by EDWARD SCARISBRITH of the Society of Jesus*.

Mariana's discourse was printed, with royal approbation; the English Jesuit's, by royal command. At that time, however, *Contradictions* were only the system of the Jesuits, and their school. This system is now the established, irrevocably established moral policy of the Church of Rome.

NOTE page 16, line 2, "tolerated by his priest."

THERE is something preposterously inconsistent in abuse heaped on the person of the King of Naples by men who are full of sympathy for his religion. *The sum of that king's iniquity is in his religion.* This is the beginning and the end and the whole extent of it; nothing more nor less. The Roman Catholic Religion, as defined by its highest authority in this country, is simply "*submission to another*," that is, to a priest: and Ferdinand II. is the most pious, the most honest, and the most thoroughly exemplary or submissive of Roman Catholics; he is so in his private as well as in his public life. Moreover, I do not believe that he was at all aware he was ever to break his oath to the Constitution, at the time he was required to make that oath. But, whether he was so warned or not, his duty at the time was discretionally dependent on *another's* will, and when the time came for that oath to be broken, it again rested discretionally with *another* to make either good faith or perjury his bounden duty. The matter, to use Dr. Wiseman's words, —fruitful of more than gold,—"*concerned his soul*," and if he had been ten times king, "*HE WAS OBLIGED TO SUBMIT to the direction of another.*" Who that *other* was, and what his *direction* should be, depended on the Provincial of the Neapolitan Jesuits:—Monsignore Cocle, the Liguorian, or Redemptorist, was only a blind. That Provincial, if I am not mistaken, was still,—when the Constitution was practically, and with such diabolical cruelty, revoked—the late Father Manera, the most distinguished, and at the same time, though with even modest courtesy, the most openly and arrogantly ambitious Jesuit, it was ever my fortune to meet in Europe or America. Now Father Manera was no more likely to let the king, or even his palace-spy, Latini, know prematurely any ulterior project, than he was likely to let the old Queen-mother or her trumpery husband know it. My conviction is that, at the time the king so solemnly swore to the Constitution, he verily believed he was to stand by it and maintain it. Why should he not have been deceived? How many English Liberals, (ay, and others too,) would have been deceived? I have in my own private correspondence, a letter dated January 3rd, 1848, from a Protestant Member of Parliament, who has held a high official station, answering my own warnings, as a loyal Roman Catholic priest, with "*I should hardly be disposed to go so far as yourself in condemning the Jesuits.*" And more than a year afterward, since my renunciation of allegiance to the See of Rome, I was gently rebuked by a great Cabinet-Minister, for thinking that the spirit of the Jesuits was not very different now from what it was a century ago! Why, then, should not the dull King of Naples have been deceived as well as wise Lord — or the Rt. Hon. —? The Jesuits seemed to regard the new Constitution, not with approbation only, but with enthusiasm. Their great pulpit was the first to ring with its glorification: their famous preacher, Father Capelloni, was the most fervent of its panegyrists: the Governor of their College, Father Liberatore, was foremost to publish in its defence: the address, "*Napolilie la Costituzione*," exhorting the students to fidelity, was from his pen; and the most striking illuminations in all Naples were those over the doors of the great Jesuit-Church. One of these illuminations, represented a group of boys crowning a bust of Ferdinand, with a stately figure of Religion, cross in hand, charging them to "*guard jealously*, (*custodite gelosi*), the precious gift which the best of princes had given them under the sanction of the Church of Christ." Another with still more daringly blasphemous hypocrisy, had for its legend these very words, "*O Jesus, Holiest of Names, only Giver of true liberty to men, do Thou irradiate, do Thou consecrate the new laws of our country's liberty!*" "*I.H.S. O NOME SANTISSIMO, UNICO DATORE DI VERA LIBERTA AGLI NOMINI, TU IRRADIA, TU CONSACRA LE NUOVE LEGGI DI PATRIA LIBERTA!*"

Oh! England, if not my native, still my venerated mother-country, dearer

to me for thy FAITH than for the blood within my veins, is it to build up a Jesuit-religion and a Jesuit-liberty that thy unwise children are accumulating Papal rubbish in the land and undermining the solid foundations of thy CHURCH and MONARCHY !

NOTE page 18, line 12, "Celtic priests."

EVEN earlier than this, February 12, 1848, the "TABLET" newspaper,—the editor of which, as stated by the Earl of C——, in his letter to the Earl of S——, "is in constant communication with Dr. Cullen," published the following singularly (and, to the uninitiated, *inexplicably*) opportune and suggestive paragraph.

"CONNEXION OF FRANCE AND IRELAND.—The Count de Montalembert, in his letter to Mr. John O'Connell, talks of the ancient connexions between France and Ireland. These are stronger than the English people understand. From 1691 to 1791 fifteen thousand Irish were constantly in the French service. At Landen, at Nerwinden, (where Sarsfield fell,) at Cremona, at Almanza, Fontenoy, &c., these regiments greatly distinguished themselves. By a decree of the Regent Duke of Orleans, 1746, every Irish Catholic was to be considered a native of France. Few of the old nobility are without Irish blood. Thus, the wretched Duc de Praslin was the representative of Marshal the Viscount Clare who commanded the Irish at Fontenoy. The Duc de Fitzjames represents worthily the great Duke of Berwick, whose wife was daughter of Lord Clanricarde, and widow of Sarsfield. Marshal Bugeaud's mother was Miss Sutton de Clonard (county of Wexford). General Lamoriciere, the best officer in France, is also Irish by his mother. Colonel M'Mahon to whom Abd-el-Kader surrendered, Marshal Reilly, Count Bourke, Colonel Cantillon, County M'Carthy, Viscount Walsh, O'Dillon Barrot, and a host of Counts and Countesses in the Faubourg Saint Germain, still retain their Irish names ; but numbers of others have adopted, as is usual in France, the names of their estates. These and the remnant of the ninety-eight at Paris associate little ; THEY HAVE, HOWEVER, ONE FEELING IN COMMON—A GREAT DISLIKE TO THE BRITISH NAME AND NATION. Bugeaud, while in command in Algeria, promoted the Irish much. The Foreign Legion is full of them. Its interpreter, the best Eastern scholar in France, was M. de Slane, a native of Eccles Street, Dublin, as he himself told the writer of this article. Colonel Sutton was his principal aide-de-camp. On Saint Patrick's day, the Marshal of Isly and most of his staff sported the trefoil on the plains of Africa ; and the Irish portion of the Foreign Legion, including our great poet's son, poor Moore, went to mass to the tune of "St. Patrick's Day in the Morning." IN CASE OF A WAR WITH ENGLAND, *these are the men who would act as interpreters in any invasion of these countries.*—J. E. O. R.—ANGLO CELT.

If the "MORNING ADVERTISER" be right in its "anticipations," the Irish brigade is, however, doing the work of English subjugation much more effectually than a French army was ever likely to do ; the Papal Cromwell and the "Irish Brigade, in the next Parliament, *will have the destinies of this country in their hands.* They will be able to make and unmake ministers at their pleasure—auctoribus Jesuitis."

NOTE page 28, "prævenire."

I REGRET to find that any Protestant should underrate the enormity of the Papal decision, even under the circumstances stated. The decision is, that in defence of life or limb, a wife has a discretionary, private right to kill her husband, a son his father, a monk his superior, a subject his sovereign.

I suppose I must take some blame to myself for not having shown the practical conclusions to be drawn from the decision, and which, of course are given, in direction, (or in the confessional, to their penitents,) by priests of the Church of Rome. I left them to be inferred by reason, when I should have done better to prove them by authority.

These conclusions, then, are:—

1. That whatever there is an undoubted or *probable* right to do, may be done without compunction or hesitation, or the interruption, (more than is absolutely indispensable,) of any, the most solemn, work in hand. *Should a priest, for instance, happen to have a fellow being to kill while celebrating the holy Eucharist, he may quietly go on with his communion, the moment he has effectually made away with him.* This is a case supposed by no less a Doctor than Lessius, and he speaks of it, as if it were the likeliest thing in the world to happen any day in the year. "Et in quocunque officio sit quis occupatus,—ut si celebret et invadatur,—potest se tueri et occidere aggressorem si necesse sit, et postea sacrum continuare."

2. That if danger of life or limb gives any private individual a right to kill, danger threatened to your honour, gives the same right; and this holds, it is expressly stated, whether the charge, made or to be made, against you, be true or false. "To attack one's reputation," says Lessius again, "*is just as bad as to attack one's life; but, it is lawful to kill any one to save your life, therefore it is lawful to do so to save your honour.*" *Periculum famæ æquipatur periculo vitæ; atqui, ob periculum vitæ licitum est occidere, ergo, &c.*" Amicus thinks this right especially belongs to priests and monks, "Quia honor proprius professionis eorum;" if they lose their honour, they lose their all; "Maximum bonum ac decus amittunt;" so that it is clear they may lawfully make away, as best they can, with any one who *threatens* even to do them or their order grievous wrong: "Unde licebit clerico vel religioso calumniatorem, gravia crimina de se vel de sua religione spargere minantem, occidere, quando alius defendendi di modus non suppetat."

3. That when it is lawful to kill your husband, or your father, or your king, *it is lawful to do it, in any way or by any means,—by poison, by sleight, or by arms, by the hands of any charitable friend, or by your own.* And for this the great founder of the Molinists is the authority I shall cite. "Fas est quancunque via et ratione, et quibuscunque armis, id totum efficere quod ad tuam defensionem fuerit necessarium."

4. That, in fine, this *right of defence* in the Church of Rome, justifies the use of every means against danger of every sort. "Jus defensionis videtur se extendere ad omne id quod necessarium est ut te ab omni injuria serves immunem." LESSIUS *de jur. et jus.*

And these conclusions, for the guidance of *directors* of consciences, are not, be it remarked, the opinion of common Doctors, but the judgments of Jesuits as illustrious as any of the Society, of such as Escobar himself compares to the Four-and-Twenty Elders seated around that throne of heaven, and whose solutions of cases he blasphemously calls a *Revelation of the Lamb!* "Reseratio ab Agno facta auctoribus Jesuitis."

NOTE C., page 29, "Italian Prince."

"It is worthy of remark that the leader of the Catholic party in France (M. de Montalembert) expressly makes all temporal questions of government, and even of personal character, subordinate to the one grand object of promoting the dominion and the interests of the See of Rome."—"TIMES," Dec. 17. 1851. Cursed with logic, and with a strong hereditary bias to be honest, Dé Montalembert, when he acknowledges the Spiritual Supremacy of the Pope, and remembers the received order of relationship between soul and body, flesh and spirit, would fain keep your animal man in subjection with grape-shot and bayonet, thumb-screw and guillotine, but,—only to the end that your spiritual man may be the better kept in slavery: and the "TIMES," with great wisdom, *porro-videns*, added, "With such dispositions among the supporters of the new Government, we question whether military power will be the sole or even the worst form of oppression the French will have to endure."

NOTE page 16, line 20, "Universal suffrage."

THE Church of Rome looks upon Universal Suffrage, the government of a numerical majority, even in a Protestant country, just as she does upon other less irresponsible forms of despotism, as only accidentally unfavourable to her over-rule. Let those actually in power be either friendly or adverse, she is always sure of one fulcrum whereon to rest her mighty lever. That Church, not Italian only, but Machiavellian in its actions, co-operates as readily and as cordially with her worst enemies as with her best friends—provided only, there can be found a ground of sincere, common hatred. Suppose, for instance, there were, even in this country, a ministry profoundly, jealously, antagonistic to the Protestant Church of England, and, consequently, obstructive to all such conservative reforms in the working of the Establishment, as would render it more loveable, more energetic, and more powerful,—a reciprocal hatred between such a government and the Papal members of the British Parliament, would only help both, more unsuspectingly and more surely, to work out their purpose. The vituperation, which each party might so unrestrainedly and so complacently indulge in would become another means of mutual success. On the other hand, the accession to power of statesmen of known fidelity to Civil Supremacy and to that Protestant Church which is the sole bulwark of the liberty, the prosperity and the respectability of Great Britain, and which, under God, is the sole hope of deliverance for Continental Europe; the accession, I say, of such statesmen to power—in spite of the personal respect and even the good feelings of Roman Catholics generally—could not be regarded by the Papal Church and her representatives in Parliament but with *unfeigned* discouragement and alarm.

NOTE page 10, "Concerns his own soul."

"In the Catholic Church no one is ever allowed to trust himself in spiritual matters. The Sovereign Pontiff is obliged to submit himself to the direction of another in whatever concerns his own soul." N. WISEMAN, Preface to "Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola. Dolman, London, 1847."

